

ON CONNECTION BETWEEN CLASSIFICATION AND DECISION PROBLEMS IN SMALL CATEGORIES

NATALIA VANETIK

Dept. of Computer Science, Ben-Gurion University,
P.O.B. 653, Beer-Sheva, Israel 84509.
e-mail address: *orlovn@cs.bgu.ac.il*

ABSTRACT. In representation theory, the problem of classifying pairs of matrices up to simultaneous similarity is used as a measure of complexity; classification problems containing it are called wild problems, and the other are referred to as tame. In this paper we study the relation between classification problems and a corresponding subclass of decision problems. We extend the tame-wild dichotomy to classification problems in small categories with the help of corresponding decision problems. We also prove a condition for a subclass of classification problems in small categories to contain tame problems only.

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of classification problem is quite wide and often refers to different aspects of classification theory. In this paper we study classification problems as problems of finding a full invariant (sometimes called full invariant system) for a given class of objects. Classification problems in representation theory are traditionally divided into two types: tame (those that are classifiable in some sense) and wild (those that contain the problem of classifying pairs of matrices up to simultaneous similarity). This terminology was introduced in [Donovan and Freislich 1972]. Tame-wild dichotomy has been studied extensively in works of Yu. Drozd (see [Drozd 1977]), D. Grigoriev (see [Grigoriev 1981]) and V. Sergeichuk ([Sergeichuk and Galinski 1993] and [Sergeichuk 1988]).

In this paper, we study a subclass of tame full invariant problems and deduce a property of wild full invariant problems as well. We are interested in full invariant problems on small categories and their subclass known as matrix problems (including the well-known pair of matrices problem). In this paper we study a connection between full invariant problems and a subclass of decision problems. Such a connection allows us to discuss the tame-wild dichotomy for full invariant problems in arbitrary small categories. We then prove a condition under which a subclass of full invariant problems is tame.

2. INVARIANTS IN SMALL CATEGORIES

A *category* $C = (\text{ob}(C), \text{hom}(C))$ consists of a class $\text{ob}(C)$ of objects and a class $\text{hom}(C)$ of morphisms between the objects that satisfy the axioms of identity and associativity. In this paper we deal with *small categories* only, i.e. categories in which both $\text{ob}(C)$ and $\text{hom}(C)$ are sets and not proper classes.

Let us define the notion of a full invariant problem in a small category. Given set X and equivalence relation $\sim$ on it, an *invariant* $\{T, Y\}$ on X is mapping $T : X \rightarrow Y$ to a set Y so that

$$x_1 \sim x_2, x_1, x_2 \in X \Rightarrow Tx_1 = Tx_2.$$

$\{T, Y\}$ is a *full invariant* if

$$x_1 \sim x_2 \Leftrightarrow Tx_1 = Tx_2$$

If T is an invariant but not a full invariant, it is called a *partial invariant*. For a small category C and an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\text{ob}(C)$ we define the *full invariant problem* for a pair $(C, \sim)$ as the problem of finding a full invariant for a set $\text{ob}(C)$ and equivalence relation $\sim$. For example, for category of square matrices over a field $\mathbf{f}$ with objects $X = M_{n \times n}(\mathbf{f})$ and equivalence relation of similarity, pair $\{T, \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$ with $T(A) = \text{rank}(A)$, is a partial invariant. Additional examples of partial invariants for this category and equivalence relation are $\{T(A) = \det(A), \mathbf{f}\}$, $\{T(A) = \text{sp}(A), \mathbb{R}^n\}$ and $\{T(A) = \det(A - \lambda I), \mathbf{f}[\lambda]\}$. A well-known example of full invariant for this problem is mapping I from matrices to similarity invariant polynomials $(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbf{f}^n[\lambda]$.

We describe here a subclass of full invariant problems dealing only with matrices and matrix transformations (this definition appears in [Belitskii and Sergeichuk 2003]) and the notion of containment for this type of problems.

Definition 1. A *matrix problem* is a pair $\mathcal{A} := (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$, where $\mathcal{A}_1$ is a set of a -tuples of matrices from $M_{n \times m}(\mathbf{f})$, where $\mathbf{f}$ is a field, and $\mathcal{A}_2$ is a set of admissible matrix transformations.

Let $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ also be a matrix problem where $\mathcal{B}_1$ is a set of b -tuples of matrices from $M_{n \times m}(\mathbf{f})$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ a set of admissible matrix transformations.

Definition 2. A matrix problem $\mathcal{A}$ is **contained in** a matrix problem $\mathcal{B}$ if there exists a b -tuple $\mathcal{T}(x) = \mathcal{T}(x_1, \dots, x_a)$ of non-commutative polynomials in $x_1, \dots, x_a$ such that

- (1) $\mathcal{T}(A_1, \dots, A_a) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ if $(A_1, \dots, A_a) \in \mathcal{A}_1$;
- (2) for every $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}_1$, A reduces to A' by transformations $\mathcal{A}_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{T}(A)$ reduces to $\mathcal{T}(A')$ by transformations $\mathcal{B}_2$.

One particular matrix problem is of special interest to us, as it has been used extensively as a measure of complexity in matrix theory. This problem allows us to separate matrix problems into 'easy' and 'hard', as the following definition states.

Definition 3. *Pair of matrices matrix problem*, denoted $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2)$, is defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_1 = \{A, B \mid A, B \in M_{n \times n}(\mathbf{f})\}, \mathcal{W}_2 = \{S(A, B)S^{-1} \mid S \in M_{n \times n}(\mathbf{f}) \text{ non-singular}\}.$$

A matrix problem is called **wild** if it contains $\mathcal{W}$ in the above sense, and **tame** otherwise.

In literature, the word 'tame' usually refers to other properties of matrices in addition to the fact that the problem does not contain $\mathcal{W}$. Here, we abuse the notation slightly and call all problems not containing $\mathcal{W}$ 'tame', rather than saying they are 'not wild'. An example of tame matrix problem is the problem of single matrix similarity $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ with

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \{A \mid A \in M_{n \times n}(\mathbf{f})\}, \mathcal{S}_2 = \{SAS^{-1} \mid S \in M_{n \times n}(\mathbf{f}) \text{ non-singular}\}.$$

The single matrix problem does not contain pair of matrices problem in the above sense, as states the famous Tame-Wild theorem by Yu. Drozd from [Drozd 1977] (a simpler formulation and proof can be found in [Belitskii and Sergeichuk 2003], Theorem 1.1). We prove this fact directly for matrices over algebraically closed field $\mathbf{f}$ for the sake of completeness. This proof was communicated by G. Belitskii.

Claim 1. $\mathcal{S}$ does not contain $\mathcal{W}$.

Proof. Let us assume that $\mathcal{W}$ is contained in $\mathcal{S}$, i.e. there exists a non-commutative polynomial $P(x_1, x_2)$ so that every two pairs of $n \times n$ matrices (A_1, A_2) and (B_1, B_2) are simultaneously similar if and only if $n \times n$ matrices $P(A_1, A_2)$ and $P(B_1, B_2)$ are similar. We choose

$(A_1, A_2) = (\lambda_1 I, \mu_1 I)$ and $(B_1, B_2) = (\lambda_2 I, \mu_2 I)$ where $(\lambda_1, \mu_1) \neq (\lambda_2, \mu_2)$. Since A_1, A_2 and B_1, B_2 commute, we can write

$$P(A_1, A_2) = c_{0,0} \mathbf{1} + \sum_{m,n} c_{m,n} \lambda_1^m \mu_1^n I \text{ and } P(B_1, B_2) = c_{0,0} \mathbf{1} + \sum_{m,n} c_{m,n} \lambda_2^m \mu_2^n I,$$

where $c_{0,0}$ is the free member of P . Equation $\sum_{m,n} c_{m,n} \lambda_1^m \mu_1^n = c$ has a non-trivial solution other than (λ_2, μ_2) in an algebraically closed field unless $\sum_{m,n} c_{m,n} \lambda_1^m \mu_1^n \equiv 0$. Thus, for a non-constant P there exist $(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \neq (\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ such that $P(\lambda_1 I, \mu_1 I) = P(\lambda_2 I, \mu_2 I)$. When P is a constant polynomial, $c_{m,n} = 0$ for all (m, n) and $P(\lambda_1 I, \mu_1 I) = P(\lambda_2 I, \mu_2 I) \equiv 0$ for all pairs (λ_1, μ_1) and (λ_2, μ_2) . $\square$

It is clear that matrix problems for a subclass of full invariant problems in small categories, $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ included.

3. EQUIVALENCE PROBLEMS IN SMALL CATEGORIES

Following classical decidability theory, we give here a definition of a subclass of decision problems (see [Papadimitriou 1993] and [Cormen et al. 2001]) as applied to the notion of a small category and equivalence relation on category's objects. In general a decision problem does not refer to equivalence of objects in a category only but is a general question in some formal system with a yes-or-no answer.

Definition 4. Let $C = (\text{ob}(C), \text{hom}(C))$ be a small category and let $\sim$ be an equivalence relation on $\text{ob}(C)$. Then an **equivalence problem** on a pair $(C, \sim)$, denoted $[C, \sim]$, is the problem of deciding for each pair $a, b \in \text{ob}(C)$ whether $a \sim b$ or not. More formally, an equivalence problem $[C, \sim]$ is a problem of finding a mapping (in the form of an algorithm or, equivalently, an abstract Turing machine) $\mu : \text{ob}(C) \times \text{ob}(C) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, where $\mu(a, b) = 1 \Leftrightarrow a \sim b$.

Definition 5. An equivalence problem $[C, \sim_C]$ **belongs to subclass** $\mathbb{X}$ of Turing machines if there exists an abstract Turing machine of class $\mathbb{X}$ computing the mapping μ .

We say that equivalence problem $[C, \sim]$ and full invariant problem for $(C, \sim)$ correspond to each other. For a small category and equivalence relation on its objects, the above equivalence problem determines the corresponding full invariant problem and vice versa.

Next, we define well-known notion of reduction (see, e.g., [Cormen et al. 2001]) as it is applied to our subclass of equivalence problems.

Definition 6. Let $C = (\text{ob}(C), \text{hom}(C))$ and $D = (\text{ob}(D), \text{hom}(D))$ be small categories and let $\sim_C$ and $\sim_D$ denote equivalence relations on $\text{ob}(C)$ and $\text{ob}(D)$ respectively. Equivalence problem $[C, \sim_C]$ **reduces** to a equivalence problem $[D, \sim_D]$ if there exists a many-to-one mapping $\mu : \text{ob}(C) \rightarrow \text{ob}(D)$ so that for all $a, b \in \text{ob}(C)$, $a \sim_C b$ if and only if $\mu(a) \sim_D \mu(b)$.

When μ is a Turing reduction of class $\mathbb{X}$, i.e. reduction computable by an oracle machine of class $\mathbb{X}$, we say that $[C, \sim_C]$ **$\mathbb{X}$ -reduces** to $[D, \sim_D]$ and write $[C, \sim_C] \leq_{\mathbb{X}}^T [D, \sim_D]$.

We call an equivalence problem $[C, \sim_C] \in \mathbb{X}$ **closed in** $\mathbb{X}$ if every other equivalence problem in $\mathbb{X}$ $\mathbb{X}$ -reduces to $[C, \sim_C]$.

4. CONNECTION BETWEEN FULL INVARIANT AND EQUIVALENCE PROBLEMS

In this section we describe the notion of containment for full invariant problems in small categories. We use reduction between equivalence problems described in previous section to define this containment.

Let us fix subclass of deterministic Turing machines $\mathbb{X}$. Let $C = (\text{ob}(C), \text{hom}(C))$ and $D = (\text{ob}(D), \text{hom}(D))$ be small categories and let $\sim_C$ and $\sim_D$ denote equivalence relations on $\text{ob}(C)$. When both $(C, \sim_C)$ and $(D, \sim_D)$ are matrix problems (denoted $(C, \sim_C) = \mathcal{A}$ and $(D, \sim_D) = \mathcal{B}$ respectively), we modify Definition 2 to suit our needs.

Definition 7. *Given a class $\mathbb{X}$ of deterministic Turing machines, we say that a matrix problem $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ is $\mathbb{X}$ -**contained** in a matrix problem $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ if there exists a b -tuple $\mathcal{T}(x) = \mathcal{T}(x_1, \dots, x_a)$ of non-commutative polynomials in $x_1, \dots, x_a$ such that*

- (1) $\mathcal{T}(A_1, \dots, A_a) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ if $(A_1, \dots, A_a) \in \mathcal{A}_1$;
- (2) for every $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}_1$, A reduces to A' by transformations $\mathcal{A}_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{T}(A)$ reduces to $\mathcal{T}(A')$ by transformations $\mathcal{B}_2$.
- (3) $\mathcal{T}(A_1, \dots, A_a)$ can be computed by a deterministic Turing machine of class $\mathbb{X}$ for every tuple $(A_1, \dots, A_a) \in \mathcal{A}_1$.

Definition 7 complies with Definition 2 for at least one class $\mathbb{X}$, since the tuple $\mathcal{T}(A_1, \dots, A_a)$ can be computed by some deterministic Turing machine, as computing the value of a polynomial over field $\mathbf{f}$ (for example, using Horner algorithm).

For the case when one of $(C, \sim_C)$ and $(D, \sim_D)$ is not a matrix problem, we will use the following new definition.

Definition 8. *A full invariant problem on $(C, \sim_C)$ is $\mathbb{X}$ -**contained** in a full invariant problem $(D, \sim_D)$ if corresponding problem $[C, \sim_C]$ is $\mathbb{X}$ -reduces to $[D, \sim_D]$, i.e. $[C, \sim_C] \leq_{\mathbb{X}}^T [D, \sim_D]$. A full invariant problem $(C, \sim_C)$ is then called $\mathbb{X}$ -**wild** if it contains $\mathcal{W}$ in the above sense and $\mathbb{X}$ -**tame** otherwise.*

One argument in favor of this definition of containment is that using arbitrary reduction leads to a contradiction. For example, applying Belitskii algorithm ([Belitskii 1983]) to pairs of matrices, one obtains canonical forms for pairs of matrices for which full invariant problem is trivial. Then we have a reduction of a wild problem to a trivial classification problem.

Let us show that the above definition is not a source of contradictions.

Claim 2. $\mathbb{X}$ -containment is well-defined.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ be two matrix problems. If $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathbb{X}$ -contained in $\mathcal{B}$ as in Definition 7, then $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathbb{X}$ -contained in $\mathcal{B}$ according to Definition 8 as well.

The opposite direction, however, needs to be proved. Let us assume that $[\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2] \leq_{\mathbb{X}}^T [\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2]$ holds for equivalence problems $[\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2]$ and $[\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2]$ corresponding to matrix problems $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ respectively. The execution of a deterministic Turing machine of class $\mathbb{X}$ that transforms an a -tuple of matrices $(A_1, \dots, A_a)$ into a b -tuple of matrices $(B_1, \dots, B_b)$ is a sequence of steps that constructs elements $b_{i,j}^k$ of matrices $B_1, \dots, B_b$ from the elements of matrices $A_1, \dots, A_a$ and previously computed values.

Let us observe a finite set representation of this machine. A transition from state S to one of the states $S_1, \dots, S_m$, $m \leq C$ and $C \in \mathbb{N}$ constant, is determined by the value x written on the tape. Let the next state be S_i when $x = c_i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. The updated value of $b_{i,j}^k := f_l$ when $x = c_l$ for $l = 1, \dots, C$ while all $f_l, c_l \in \mathbf{f}$. Since $\mathbf{f}$ is a field, this transition can be described by a polynomial $P_S(x)$ of constant degree using any type of polynomial interpolation (for example, the method of divided differences). The next polynomial to be computed is $P_{S_i}(x)$, that depends on the value c_i that caused the machine to move from state S to state S_i . A transition polynomial $P_{S \rightarrow}(x) = P_{S_i}(x)(P_S(x))$ in point $x = c_i$ describes this step. Again,

classical interpolation can be used to express $P_{S \rightarrow}(x)$. Therefore, each $b_{i,j}^k$ is expressed by superposition of polynomials, denoted $P_{i,j}^k(A_1, \dots, A_a)$. We now can write

$$P_k(A_1, \dots, A_a) := \sum P_{i,j}^k(A_1, \dots, A_a) I_{i,j},$$

where $I_{i,j}$ denotes a matrix with zeroes at every place except (i, j) . The resulting tuple $(P_1, \dots, P_b)$ ensures $\mathbb{X}$ -containment of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{B}$ as matrix problems, as it is computable by a deterministic Turing machine of class $\mathbb{X}$. Therefore, the notion of $\mathbb{X}$ -containment for full invariant problems in small categories, including matrix problems, is well-defined. $\square$

Now, we prove a condition under which $\mathbb{X}$ -containment, where $\mathbb{X}$ is a subclass of deterministic Turing machines, ensures that every full invariant problem $(C, \sim_C)$ with equivalence problem $[C, \sim_C] \in \mathbb{X}$ is $\mathbb{X}$ -tame.

Claim 3. *Let C and D be small categories. Let $[C, \sim_C]$ be closed in $\mathbb{X}$ and $(C, \sim_C)$ be $\mathbb{X}$ -tame. Then every full invariant problem with a corresponding equivalence problem in $\mathbb{X}$ is also $\mathbb{X}$ -tame.*

Proof. Let be $(D, \sim_D)$ a full invariant problem with a corresponding equivalence problem $[D, \sim_D] \in \mathbb{X}$. As $[D, \sim_D]$ is $\mathbb{X}$ -reducible to any decision problem closed in $\mathbb{X}$, including $[C, \sim_C]$, the definition of $\mathbb{X}$ -containment gives us a contradiction. $\square$

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we study full invariant problems in small categories and define the notion of containment for them using a subclass of equivalence problems of decision problems. We use definitions of matrix problems and matrix problem containment in order to define the tame-wild dichotomy for full invariant problems in small categories and show that the new notion is well-defined. We then prove a condition for all full invariant problems of a certain class to be $\mathbb{X}$ -tame for a given subclass $\mathbb{X}$ of deterministic Turing machines.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Prof. Genrich Belitskii for the help in preparation of this article.

REFERENCES

- [Belitskii 1983] Belitskii, G., 1983. Normal form in the matrices space. J. Analysis in Infinite-Dimensional Spaces and Operator Theory, (V.A.Marchenko, Ed.) Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 3-15 (in Russian).
- [Belitskii and Sergeichuk 2003] Belitskii, G., Sergeichuk, V., 2003. Complexity of matrix problems. J of Linear Algebra Appl. 361, 203-222.
- [Cormen et al. 2001] Cormen, T.H., Leiserson, C.E., Rivest, R.L., Stein, C., 2001. Introduction to Algorithms, MIT Press.
- [Drozd 1977] Drozd, Yu.A., 1977. On tame and wild matrix problems. J. Matrix Problems, Institute of Mathematics, Kiev, 104-114.
- [Donovan and Freislich 1972] Donovan, P., Freislich, M.R., 1972. Some evidence for an extension of the Brauer-Thrall conjecture, Sonderforschungsbereich Theor. Math. 40, 24-26.
- [Grigoriev 1981] Grigoriev, D., 1981. On the complexity of the “wild” matrix problems, of the isomorphism of algebras and graphs. Notes of Scientific Seminars of LOMI, vol.105, p.10-17 (in Russian) (English translation in J.Soviet Math., vol.22, 1983, p.1285-1289).
- [Papadimitriou 1993] Papadimitriou, C., 1993. Computational Complexity, 1st edition, Addison Wesley.
- [Sergeichuk 1988] Sergeichuk, V., 1988. Classification problems for systems of forms and linear mappings. J. Math. USSR Izvestiya, 31 (no. 3), 81-501.
- [Sergeichuk and Galinski 1993] Sergeichuk, V., Galinski, D.V., 1993. Classification of pairs of linear operators in a four-dimensional vector space. J. Infinite Groups and Related Algebraic Structures, Inst. Mat. Ukrain. Akad. Nauk, Kiev, 413-430 (in Russian).